

# **Is Sexual Sterilization Easy?**

**THE SURPRISING ATTITUDE OF DOCTORS TOWARD A SIMPLE  
OPERATION—A STUDY OF VARIOUS FACTS ABOUT  
STERILIZATION, INCLUDING ITS LEGAL STATUS**

**By D. O. CAULDWELL, M.D., Sc.D.**

# **Is Sexual Sterilization Easy?**

**THE SURPRISING ATTITUDE OF DOCTORS TOWARD A SIMPLE  
OPERATION—A STUDY OF VARIOUS FACTS ABOUT  
STERILIZATION, INCLUDING ITS LEGAL STATUS**

**By D. O. CAULDWELL, M.D., Sc.D.**

**HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS  
GIRARD, KANSAS**



Copyright, 1947  
By E. Haldeman-Julius

*Printed in the United States of America*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Sexual sterilization is a simple operation. It prevents parenthood. It can be performed on the male in a matter of minutes in a doctor's office. The sexual sterilization of the female usually requires opening the abdomen. Nothing is removed from either the male or the female. The operation performed on either sex has not been found to have physical effects other than the prevention of parenthood, although there has been, and is, controversy as to whether this is conclusive. In rare instances psychic reactions may occur as sequellae. It has been found that in these instances there was either a pre-existing neurosis or psychosis or both, or a tendency toward either of both of these conditions.

Persons desiring to have themselves sexually sterilized do not always readily find a doctor who is willing to perform the operation. There are numerous reasons why doctors will or will not perform the operation producing sexual sterilization. Many of these reasons will be explained later.

Because of certain educational work that I do, I receive a large number of letters seeking information on scientific sex subjects. Not long ago a correspondent asked whether there is a law against voluntary sexual sterilization. To my knowledge there is none. Later, this correspondent asked if I could direct him to a doctor in his city (a large one) who would be willing to do the operation of sexual sterilization for him. Information disclosed tended to show that the correspondent had ethical reasons for seeking sexual sterilization.

Being familiar with the work of Birthright, Inc., a non-profit organization working along sane and ethical lines for human betterment, I immediately wrote Mrs. Marian S. Olden, executive secretary, at Princeton, N. J., requesting assistance. Mrs. Olden advised me that there was not a doctor member of the organization in the correspondent's State. She referred me to a lady physician in an adjoining State. Arrangements were made with this physician for my correspondent to get in touch with her.

This certainly seems a long way around for a simple operative procedure which can be easily and quickly performed by almost any physician in his office.

A lady correspondent desired to contact a physician in her locality, capable and willing, to perform electro-surgical sexual sterilization. After writing several letters I located such a surgeon.

Eugenically, it is not desirable to sexually sterilize persons capable of attaining parenthood under conditions favorable to the potential progeny of such persons.

Because intelligent persons sometimes confuse sexual sterilization with castration it should be made clear now that sexual sterilization is not castration. Sexual sterilization does not retard sexual power. It does not affect the power to perform the sexual act.

Certain States have compulsory sterilization laws which apply to certain classes of individuals. A thorough explanation of the status of sterilization laws will be given later in this book.

The White House Conference on Child Welfare and Protection, in 1930, adopted the following dictum:

"There should be no child in America that has not the complete *birthright* of a sound mind in a sound body, and that has not been born under proper conditions."



The proposal is a brief and valuable eugenic guide. It can be made the basis for vast research, and volumes of potent reading material.

Birthright, Inc., states that:

*"Selective sterilization designates a program that, while covering a wide range of people, carefully selects only those who are unqualified for parenthood."*

Eugenics means to be well born. The practice of eugenics seeks to improve the quality of the human family—the human races. There exists a school of geneticists which regards the practice of eugenics solely with the eye of science. This school holds that it is just as legitimate, moral, ethical and proper to prevent the conception of a defective person as it is to practice isolation, vaccination and inoculation of persons to prevent an infectious disease.

In this book data will be presented as to the nature of the operation preventing parenthood, how it is performed and under what circumstances the operation may, at this time, be reversed. Persons who are unqualified for parenthood will be discussed. Some of the other data to be presented will embrace such topics as: Feeble-mindedness, children of incestuous parentage, heredity and hereditary diseases, the relation of sterilization to human rights, legislative angles, criminals and sterilization, sterilization and class legislation, politics, etc.

Suppose a person desires to be sexually sterilized. How can a doctor be found who will perform the operation? Why are doctors hesitant in agreeing to sexually sterilize a person?

It has been said that when ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise. One is led rather to think that ignorance can never be bliss.



## II. WHEN SHOULD LIFE BE PROLONGED?

It is common knowledge that the present life span is almost double that of the years around the turn of the century. This may seem good. It assuredly means that man has found ways and means of conquering diseases that once destroyed untold numbers in what should have been the prime of life. Let us listen, however, to the well-known H. L. Mencken. A pamphlet on sexual sterilization questions, issued by Birthright, Inc., gives the following data:

"A report prepared for President Franklin D. Roosevelt by a faculty committee of the Georgia School of Technology, in Atlanta, declared that advances in medical science were bringing about decadence in our national health. 'Prolonging the lives of the weak and the physically unfit is, in a real sense, undermining the physical well-being of future generations.'

"Particulars of this wholesale conservation of our worst human stock are found in a survey of the work of the women's clinic of Johns Hopkins Hospital, made by one of their staff. H. L. Mencken in commenting on this survey, complimented the work of giving service to 1,000 of the poor daily but added that nevertheless 'Johns Hopkins is the most brutally anti-social agency ever set up in Baltimore.' After reciting the details of the clinic's work, he added: 'Imagine permitting such ghastly caricatures of humanity to reproduce their kind ad libitum, and not only permitting it, but even facilitating it. The women who are delivered of pathological specimens today are the daughters of pathological specimens who were delivered at the women's clinic 20 years ago.' And finally, he asks: 'How long are we going to endure a raid on public health, the public security and the public solvency that increases in sweep and boldness every year?'

"The Johns Hopkins authorities, refusing to be quoted by name, said: 'Mr. Mencken's statements might also apply to any of the large hospitals of any of the large cities in the country. He has undoubtedly focused attention on one of the real problems of society today but it rests with other agencies and other authorities to correct this and not with the hospitals.' In the summation of the original survey we find the statement that perhaps the best means of effectual control of the propagation of the mentally unfit would be legal sterilization."

Is it wise to raise the fertility rate of the mentally unfit and thereby increase the demand for public charity and additional space in our tax-supported institutions? L. L. Burlingame's "Heredity and Social Problems" believed, in 1940, that socialized medicine was on its way. It further believed that without a program of sterilization adequate medical care under socialized medicine would raise the fertility rate of persons unfit for parenthood more than 10 percent.

Birthright believes that, "If medicine must save hundreds of thousands of inferior organisms and nullify the purging effect of the survival of the fittest, medical ethics ought to inspire physicians to lead in the fight for unpopular measures which will be our biological salvation."

In July, 1940, Professor Ernest A. Hooton, speaking before the New England Conference on Tomorrow's Children, said: "Medical science has rescued the perishing until the human stock resembles one gigantic fire-sale of damaged goods. We must reclaim man before we can salvage civilization."



In 1938, the Report of the Committee on Population Problems to the National Resources Committee, stated:

"There is absolutely no doubt about the existence generally at present on the negative relationship in the U. S. between fertility and social or economic status. . . . It is well established that families on relief are on the average more fertile than non-relief families in the same community . . . poverty means handicapped child development. Present differential birthrates subject a disproportionately large number of children in each succeeding generation to the blighting effect of poverty."

Burlingame's "Heredity and Social Problems" has estimated that the low class of social inadequates is probably increasing by 15 percent to 20 percent each generation and the average intelligence falling about two to three percent.

It is observed by Birthright that low intelligence is associated with physical defects, yet this class is the only class whose birth rate has not declined.

The ideas of the philosopher may embrace those of the several sciences and be reasonable. The geneticist will, of course, have his theories for the improvement of humanity and civilization and it is likely that these theories will be generally sound. The anthropologist may invariably be depended on to advance rational ideas for the improvement of the quality of mankind. The scientist, regardless of the label his school of thought happens to bear, is always willing to contribute his share to the improvement of humanity. Medical and sanitary scientists are contributing magnificently toward the betterment of the human species. At the same time, the physician, basically a humanitarian, cannot easily stand by and see human life snuffed out when his hand can stay the hand of death. The physician falls when he is willing to try any kind of new "shot" for the prevention of disease, yet denies his skill to those who are willing to prevent the birth of those destined to be or to become derelicts or near-derelicts, and to procreate, thereby producing more of their kind.

Life is dear to all who live. It seems right that this should be true. The true physician owes it to humanity to relieve suffering and to prolong life. On the other hand, the physician may be regarded as owing a different kind of obligation to humanity because it is within his power to discharge such an obligation. This is the obligation of contributing every effort possible to the improvement of the quality of mankind just as living conditions for mankind have been improved.

I well remember one case of a patient who came under my care. She was a young woman—in her early twenties—and was the mother of three fine children of far above the average heredity. She was pregnant and I am aware that she did not want to be. There was no apparently good reason for aborting her. Heavy lifting initiated a miscarriage. An ultra-religious-minded elderly woman relative went to the rescue. The patient lived in a country community more than 50 miles from the nearest town. Roads at the time were bad because it was the winter season and roads in that locality were not paved. I had my hands and a small hospital filled with influenza and pneumonia patients with a scattering of measles and various other cases with several prolific women seemingly trying to see who could beat each other to the draw and call me to assist the lazy old stork. The mother of the threatened miscarriage patient talked with me by phone. She gave me but a partial picture of the case. It appeared that the patient was in no danger. What I could not know was that the fetus was dead and that the foot of the patient's bed had been raised high in an effort to "save this child for God." Nor did I know that the patient had already developed pelvic peritonitis and that the symptoms of this had been masked by quantities of aspirin—the latter naturally permitting no show of fever.



When I was called to this case I found the lower abdomen of the patient appearing as though the pregnancy had reached the six, instead of the three, months' stage. I rushed her to a hospital and with associates performed emergency surgery. Everything possible was done to save or suitably prolong the life of this mother. I promised myself that if the patient could be saved she would be sexually sterilized. The fight lasted several days and was lost. This was a case wherein life should have been prolonged—but under vastly altered conditions. During the days of the "watch" over this young woman I reflected often upon the strange desires of "God" for a dead and disintegrated foetus at the three months' level of development. I agreed with the many preachers who cavorted at the funeral of this young woman (who, herself, had no belief in God or gods of any kind) that the ways of God are strange indeed.

Everyone who reads is aware that from time to time so-called "mercy-killings" are committed. In these instances someone evidently did not believe that the life of another human should be prolonged. Reading between the lines, frequently a habit of mine, even when reading that which I have written, I have seen that mercy in these "mercy killings" was invariably meant for those who had the burden of the person so *benevolently* killed. The methods of killing have not always been the most merciful that might have been chosen.

To me it seems that there is but one humanitarian view to take of the prolongation of life. It is that once there is life it should be prolonged to the utmost. Every such life should be given the intelligent aid of science, and actual defectives should not be permitted to reproduce themselves.

According to the findings of geneticists on the laws of the genes, a child's heredity may be totally devoid of the characters and qualities of either parent. (See my Haldeman-Julius book, "Semen for Sale," for data on the genes.) It can never be known that this will be the case. Now and then the child of mentally unfit parents may become a genius. At the same time the same parents may bring into being several defective children. Geniuses have always been born. It stands to reason that the genius born of high-grade parentage will be of much greater worth to the human family than the genius descended from a defective family tree. Those moronic moralists who cry out that *all* persons should not only be permitted and encouraged to reproduce but should be required to do so, especially as a *religious* duty, are to be compared to the foolish gambler who is forever losing all but his life (and he sometimes loses that in a poker-game argument) on the chance of one day making a "big winning" and retiring to a quiet place in the country with the cows, the pigs, and the chickens.

Let the humanitarian prolong life once life exists, but let the geneticist not be hampered in continually improving the human breed to at least compare with the better breeds of our domestic animal friends.

### III. THE STERILIZATION OPERATION

#### A Comparison of Sterilization and Castration

As has been explained, the operation for sexually sterilizing the male is simple. A small slit is made in the scrotum and the spermatic cord is exposed. This cord contains a small, bristle-like passage or lumen through which pass the spermatozoa (male fertilizing element). The exposed cord is (1) simply tied so that its passage is closed, or (2) closed with two ties a half inch or so apart and severed between the ties. The scrotum is then closed, usually with a single suture. The operation can be performed in a matter of minutes.



Tying or tying and severing the spermatic cord in no way interferes with the secretions of the testicle or its production of sperm. The spermatozoa simply cannot pass to the outside of the body. The quantity of ejaculate is not notably diminished by the sterilization procedure because of the fact that the testicle furnishes but an infinitesimal part of the total ejaculate and the quantity of ejaculate varies (1) according to each individual, (2) according to the frequency of intercourse, and (3) factors present at the time of ejaculation, including the intensity of sexual excitement at the time.

When castration is performed the entire testicle is removed. Castration does not always destroy the power to perform the sexual act when performed after puberty when suitable maturity has been attained.

A man cannot be regarded as being sterile and therefore incapable of fatherhood immediately after the sterilization operation has been completed. Live spermatozoa may remain in the spermatic passage (ahead of the tie or severed portion) for days or even weeks. Live sperms have been found as long as six weeks after the sterilization operation. To be certain, it is necessary that ejaculate be examined microscopically by a physician or a trained person under the physician's direction.

The sexual sterilization of the female is not quite as easy or simple as that of the male. The ovaries (egg-forming glands) are situated inside the body. It is necessary to open the abdomen of a woman in order to sexually sterilize her. After the abdomen has been opened and the Fallopian tubes (passages from the ovaries to the uterus) exposed, the tubes are tied or tied and severed. The abdomen is closed. In castration of the female the ovaries are removed. Tying the Fallopian tubes does not affect the sex life except that ova cannot pass into the uterus nor in any way come in contact with male sperm. No other function is disturbed. Menstruation is in no way affected.

Various conditions produce natural sterility, either temporary or permanent, in woman. Mild internal inflammation sometimes causes the tubes to close and the passage (inner) surfaces to adhere, thus preventing the passage of ova. Women thus sterile are unaware of the fact and often wonder why they do not conceive. Inflammation extending into the scrotum sometimes sterilizes man in the same manner. When natural sterilization takes place in either man or woman neither is aware of the change. It may thus be judged, even by the rawest layman, that sexual sterilization has but one effect upon either the male or the female, i.e., that of preventing parenthood.

Much has been said, by temporizing moralists and others ignorant of the truth, against robbing man or woman of the power to reproduce themselves. The expression, to reproduce a person's self, is a misnomer. A person's self is never reproduced, because the child born of parents is another self—and by no means the self of either parent.

Those who contend that every man and woman should reproduce and thereby "leave someone to take their places on earth," are usually as impractical in their other beliefs. When one ceases to exist one no longer has a place on earth. Were this sort of reasoning logical there would be no place for the newborn until a parent vacated his place in favor of the new life.

In the days before antiseptic surgery people died like poisoned flies from surgical infection. A surgical ward was a stench and a place to be avoided by all who were not, of necessity, compelled to attend it. The surgeon, in those days, walked into the operating room from the street, donned an operating coat (often a fancy Prince Albert or an alpaca) be-smearred with the pus and blood of previous operations, picked up his instruments as he found them, and started operating. Often the surgeon had harnessed his own horse and had driven to the hospital. Surgery certainly wasn't extensively successful anyway and many per-



sons agreed to surgery as a last resort. It is really a wonder the science ever developed into the science of precision it is today. Students in those days, passing the surgical wards, or dealing with patients who had undergone surgery, held their noses and thought they were really advancing as young Hippocrations when they learned to speak of "that good old surgical stink."

Feeble-minded persons, the criminally insane, and persons who transmit various diseases to their descendants, are, to society in general, what the lack of antiseptic surgery was to humanity as a whole a comparatively few short years ago. They transmit human "infections." Yet, ignorant persons who appreciate the value of antiseptic surgery, fight the passage and enforcement of laws designed to remove the human stench from society.

The operation sexually sterilizing a person actually robs the person of nothing. The procedure is safe, sane, and, in selected cases, can do no harm either to individuals or to the future of the race. On the other hand, it is a refinement which, within one or two generations, can vastly improve the quality of humanity. Feeble-mindedness, certain kinds of insanity, and various hereditary diseases could be stamped out almost within a generation by universal selective sterilization.

No one would return to surgery without antisepsis, and yet, procreation sans antisepsis of the product of procreation, remains the fetish with millions of uninformed persons.

#### IV. THE SURPRISING ATTITUDE OF DOCTORS

Any person who trusts his family physician as a friend and counselor may be quite surprised at some of the counsel he may receive under certain circumstances. Now and then a person who applies to his physician for sexual sterilization and is counseled against it, forms the opinion that the simple surgery involved is, at that, too intricate for his family physician. In certain instances this is true. Many doctors are good physicians who, as surgeons, are actually incapable of lancing a common boil. There are good physicians who shrink from using the knife for any purpose whatever.

Often a person may be strangely confused by the counsel a physician gives against sexual sterilization. Few doctors of the Roman Catholic faith will perform the operation of sexual sterilization. Those few who perform the operation are ecclesiastically regarded as renegades. On the other hand, I have personally discussed selective sexual sterilization with many priests who explained to me (confidentially, of course) that personally they were highly in favor of the method offered for improving the quality of humanity. Surprising as it may seem, I have known many priests who, as individuals, were actually thoroughly atheistic. Let one call them hypocritical—such will not change matters. These men have given up much to gain little. Often, however, the little is not to be sneezed at.

A little digression will serve to illustrate a priestly attitude. Many years ago, I, a youngster, felt I was in love with a healthy Irish colleen, lass or whatever one chooses to call a desirable Irish immigrant girl. We reached the point of planning marriage. In fairness, I agreed to go down and talk with the priest. I went with a mixed feeling of resentment and amusement.

The priest was a jovial Irish-American. I explained to him in the beginning that I had never been able to have any belief in any sort of a god. We drank some excellent wine and smoked some excellent cigars. And we discussed numerous scientific matters. I liked this priest. He advanced no argument that I should even attempt to become a Catholic,



nor indeed any sort of Theist. I found myself wondering. I was in thorough agreement with much that this man said. And he appeared to be in thorough agreement with much that I said. Even so, I was surprised when he explained that although he would by no means give up a comfortable parish income and various immunities, he was thoroughly and completely atheistic. "Give up what I have?" he asked. "What could I do? Get a teaching post, perhaps, with luck, that would pay me but a fraction of the income I now enjoy. No, thank you. I've known poor professors, as you have. But it is a real pleasure to meet with one like yourself now and then—someone with whom I can talk freely."

Assuredly, I had expected to meet with opposition and argument. At the time, I was a student, and a fairly raw one. I rarely lost a moment of reading time. And, when leaving for my visit to the priest, I had stuffed my pockets with Little Blue Books—some of which contained some potent anti-theistic material. I think I had just become acquainted with the Little Blue Books.

Having found the "father" an agreeable person, I offered the books I had taken with me as possible ammunition for his perusal. He opened a drawer of his desk and displayed to me more titles than I could boast of possessing. The following day, I sat through half an hour of lecture by a Catholic doctor who postulated upon the evils of contraception.

I did not marry the girl.

It is not just the Catholic doctor who refuses to perform the operation of sexual sterilization, nor is it just the Catholic doctor who is opposed to it.

There are numerous good reasons why doctors in general feel they may be sticking their necks out if they do sexual sterilizations. At present, there is a bare possibility of reversing the sterilization operation in woman. I shall not go into the details of that. Reversal of the operation has been performed upon the male with an encouraging degree of success.

People do not always know just what they want. Doctors have been sued for doing sexual sterilization. And aside from religious or any sort of scruples, the danger of litigation probably prevents doctors from agreeing to do sexual sterilization in a greater number of instances than any other factor imaginable. Who wants to be sued?

Doctors do sterilize women quite frequently. In fact, doctors not only sterilize women frequently—they often surgically remove ovaries, tubes and uterus. There is little "come-back" at law in these cases. Serious pathology is given due weight even by biased juries.

One may wonder why a man or woman would want to be sexually sterilized and then later desire a reversal of the operative procedure—a reversal of the condition. Sensible men and women—for example, a husband and wife—may have as many children as they are capable of supporting and schooling. Sterilization may be desirable. Circumstances may change in time so that they find themselves able to support and educate still other children. Reversal of the sterilization might seem desirable under such circumstances. On the other hand, either husband or wife may die. The living party may, in time, desire to marry again. Often the new mate will desire children. A reversal of the sterilization procedure could be desirable under such circumstances.

Some time ago one doctor caustically expressed himself on the matter of sexual sterilization and eugenics. I had just discussed eugenics and hereditary diseases before a small group of physicians. Privately, as we stood in a corridor a few moments later, this particular doctor remarked to me, "Hell, Cauldwell, don't you know that if you bring about all of the improvement you advocate in the human race the practice of medicine will become *non est*? We need people to practice on. In a few more years we'll be dead and gone, but if there were no imperfect people and no diseases we'd have to do something else and I'm sure I don't want to do anything else. We need defectives."



Surprisingly, this is the actual attitude of more doctors than one wants to believe as fact.

Finally, no matter what work one does, and no matter how well one likes his work, there will invariably be some particular phase of his work for which he cares little—perhaps nothing. If he can do his work and avoid that which is thoroughly uninteresting to him, he will do so. Many doctors simply do not like to do sexual sterilization operations any more than many persons do not like to scrub floors or wash dishes. And, under such circumstances, why should one do that which is not absolutely necessary, and which one prefers, personally, if only for lethargic reasons, not to do?

## V. SELECTIVE STERILIZATION AND HEREDITARY DISEASES

What disease or defect may be regarded as unquestionably hereditary? According to "Medical Genetics and Eugenics," published by the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, in 1940, "Any disease which is not due to mechanical or chemical injury or to some external living agent such as a parasite, a bacterium, or a virus, is likely to have an inherited basis."

What constitutes feeble-mindedness? In Publication No. 22, of Birth-right, Inc., the executive secretary, Mrs. Marian S. Olden, has explained:

"To be classified as feeble-minded, a person must be incapable of managing his own affairs prudently and maintaining himself independently. This lack of social capacity must itself be the result of a subnormal degree of intelligence, which has been arrested in its course of development. (Arrested development of intelligence marks the feeble-minded, whereas disordered or deteriorated intelligence marks the epileptic or the insane.) Personality characteristics are also important such as general prudence, favorable attitude, good judgment, foresight, responsibility, self-control and profiting from experience. Characteristically the feeble-minded are lacking in these respects, with consequent shiftlessness or improvidence.

"Just as intelligence is measured in terms of mental age, and the intelligence quotient, so social aptitude may be measured in terms of social age and social quotients, as for example, by means of the Vineland Maturity Scale, which was developed by Edgar A. Doll, who was Director of Research in the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey.

"Speaking of the dual criteria of feeble-mindedness, Dr. Doll said, 'Subnormal intelligence alone is not sufficient unless it is of developmental constitutional origin (hereditary or acquired) which results in social incompetence at maturity. . . . If a single criterion is to be employed, the social criterion is much more satisfactory than the mental criterion.'

"This assumes that interest in the mentally deficient person springs from his inherent inability to manage his own affairs without the need of assistance."

Heredity plays an important part in determining intelligence. Mental deficients are rarely, under existing conditions, protected from parenthood. In numerous instances the certifying doctor where a woman was committed to an institution because of mental deficiency, has attended the same woman, later released (but not cured) in childbirth.

The mentally deficient person should be protected from parenthood regardless of whether he manifests deficiency as hereditary, or develops deficiency because of accident or disease. That protection is



not encouraged sufficiently, or is not given, is evidenced by the present high rate of mental deficiency.

When final figures are available, it will be interesting to know just what percentage of registrants for selective service in World War II were rejected because of some form of mental deficiency.

The National Resources Committee's "The Problems of a Changing Population," 1938, indicated that mental disease at that time constituted 60 percent of our total hospital load. And, Dr. Franz J. Kallman's "Genetics of Schizophrenia," 1938, p. 163, gave this information:

"The probable incidence of schizophrenia among the offspring of schizophrenics is 19 times greater than in the general population. Even the grandchildren, nephews and nieces are, in their turn, five times as likely as the normal average person to become schizophrenic."

Burlingame's "Heredity and Social Problems," 1940, explained:

"We must be content with the conclusion that schizophrenia is inherited and that environment has not been shown to play a large differential role in its causation."

Manic depressives appear to rank next to schizophrenics in number, and observers have been impressed with the striking evidence of the inherited factor in this condition.

Birthright Publication No. 22 states that, up to 1926, every case of Huntington's chorea in the United States was descended from three brothers. In view of this, it may be concluded that Huntington's chorea is due solely to heredity.

The Committee of the American Neurological Association for the Investigation of Eugenic Sterilization recommended that epilepsy be included in any sterilization program "mainly on the ground of the social situation."

According to Dr. Lucian Home, of the Howe Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Harvard University:

"It is the duty of the students of eugenics to unite in an effort to obtain the control by law of hereditary blindness."

In 1930, it was estimated that there were 114,000 blind persons in the United States, and that practically 30 percent of these were due to congenital causes.

The Federal Census in 1930 indicated a population of 57,084 deaf mutes in the United States. It is agreed that deaf-mutism is decidedly hereditary in character.

Various authorities believe that through careful study, analysis and selection, nearly all hereditary diseases could be relegated to history within the space of two or three generations through the medium of sexual sterilization.

That birth control is not, cannot, and probably will not begin to be an answer to the control of hereditary diseases, is due to many factors. Failure may be summed up in that trite saying: "There's many a slip 'twixt cup and lip."

*Note:* I have but skimmed the surface in presenting the data contained in this chapter. This has been done for the reason that that which has been presented should serve to give the reader a good idea of the general situation without tiring him. In a sense I have reported facts, projecting little from my personal point of view into the discussion. It is for this reason, and because of other material to be presented, even with free expression of my personal opinion of what the present generation of the various scientists should leave to posterity, that I desire to make a declaration. The declaration is this: Legislation may be and often is necessary for the accomplishment of various benefits to mankind. We cannot deny that enforced sanitation has greatly benefited the human family. We cannot dispute public health measures such as isolation of infectious diseases, in the benefits they have wrought for



mankind. We must acknowledge various other legislative measures as having resulted in benefit to mankind.

In speaking and in writing I have referred at various times to compulsory legislation. This is because of the fact that until there is more extensive education (and therefore greater universal intelligence), some crutch should be used. I'll admit that I'd rather walk on a crutch than not walk—but this does not indicate that I'd like the crutch.

It is my personal opinion that we already have far too much legislation and that intelligent solons could spend the next decade in repealing more than 95 percent of our present legislation to the ultimate national benefit.

A prosthesis cannot take the place of a natural leg. No amount of legislation can do what extensive education can accomplish. Neither "goodness" nor intelligence can be legislated into a people. There is faint hope that at least a degree of defectiveness can be legislated out of present eugenic methods. Education must do the rest. Perhaps we cannot be too choosy how this education is accomplished—if headway is made. If the clergy can forget their "And it came to pass," long enough to spread a glimmer of eugenic education among their flocks, I will assuredly go along with them—that far.

## VI. CHILDREN OF INCESTUOUS PARENTAGE

Otherwise intelligent people go about prattling about the idiots, imbeciles, morons and deformed creatures that result from incestuous parentage. There is apparently no end of misinformation on this subject.

One basic truth should be remembered at all times with regard to incestuous sexual relationship. Because of the social undesirability of such practice, few persons, not in some way inferior, will indulge in incestuous sexual relations. It is for this reason, more than any other, that the offspring of near relatives are more likely to be defective than otherwise. A sexual partner from a different strain, even though he or she have many hereditary taints, is less likely to transmit such taints to his or her posterity than a mate of the same strain or stock.

There is a belief all too common that undesirable characters and qualities in the progeny of an incestuous sexual relationship, result as a matter of punishment for "evil-doing." This is not, in any way, true. Regardless of moral and social codes, the law of genes operates—and the child of positively defective parents may inherit neither the defectiveness nor physical features from either parent. This applies to all. The chances that a perfect child will be born to deficient parents are, however, infinitesimal. To consider taking the chance may be to produce other deficiencies.

If the background of blood relations is good there is every chance that such persons will produce a child equally as good as, or even superior to, the parents.

The question, "Can two normal people have a feeble-minded child?" has been asked by Birthright. It aptly gives the following answer:

"When a completely normal person mates with a feeble-minded person there is introduced into the germplasm of their offspring a factor of feeble-mindedness. This factor or gene is called recessive because it does not appear when the factor of normality is combined with it. Normality is dominant over feeble-mindedness.

"A recessive defect introduced into the germplasm may be carried for many generations without any sign of its appearing and when its origin is forgotten, the carriers believe themselves to be entirely normal. But when two carriers of the same defect



mate, it is likely that one or more of their children will exhibit the original defect.

"Thus a feeble-minded child results when, in the shuffle of the chromosomes at the time of conception, the one for feeble-mindedness from the male unites with the one for feeble-mindedness from the female.

"Recessive characteristics appear in the offspring only when similar recessives, present in both parents, combine."

The principles which have just been explained are the same whether the parents be of close blood relationship, or of no blood relationship. The explanation is a concise answer to the age-old question of the offspring of incestuous sexual relationships which result in progeny.

A person who has, at some time, an opportunity to travel from community to community, may observe some interesting facts of heredity. People not socially isolated show less deficiency and a lesser number of various defectives than most people who have been isolated and have thus, through generations of isolation, fostered the union of those with recessive characteristics. This is especially noticeable in numerous "pioneer" communities of the Southwest where there has been but little infiltration of outside blood for the past 300 years. Epileptics are common as well as those afflicted with dementia praecox. The condition is not one of inbreeding (incest) as might be believed by the casual traveler and observer. Among the people of these isolated communities there are some strong characters. I have observed, however, in one particular region of Kentucky and in a number of communities in Arkansas, a combination of recessives where inbreeding has been common. In such communities I have observed little general difference in the number and kind of defectives regardless of whether inbreeding existed.

## VII. STERILIZATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

If every person on earth would treat the person of his fellows as inviolable, two major crimes, murder and rape, could never occur. It is because of ignorance and the fact that man does not treat the persons of his fellows as inviolable that laws must step in for the protection of society—or mankind in general.

If anyone can contend that law has no right to compel a person to undergo sexual sterilization, then such a one must agree that sexual sterilization is the right of any human desiring such sterilization.

Facts often fail to change warped reasoning.

It was on the last day of December, in 1930, that Pope Pius XI issued an Encyclical, in which he held:

"Those who are over-solicitous for the cause of eugenics . . . wish the civil authority to arrogate to itself a power over a faculty which they never had and can never legitimately possess. Those who act in this way are at fault in losing sight of the fact that the family is more sacred than the State, and that men are begotten not for the earth and for time but for heaven and eternity.

"Public magistrates have no direct power over the bodies of their subjects, therefore where no crime has taken place and there is no cause present for grave punishment, they can never directly harm or tamper with the integrity of the body, either for reasons of eugenics or for any other reason."

Organized opposition to legal sterilization rallies forth under this dictum.

In politics we may vigorously oppose a candidate for office. Should such candidate win an election, the majority of us will recognize the



candidate as the representative of organized government. We may be bitterly opposed to a law. (Does anyone remember the Volstead Act?) Being opposed to a law, if we are good citizens, we at least recognize the law. It is not a requirement of good citizenship to observe every law. Were such the case we would have no good citizens.

The power of civil authority over the faculty to propagate has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1927 (*Buck vs. Bell*—1927—47 Sup. Ct. Rep. 584, 274 U. S. 200) the Supreme Court ruled:

"We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the state for these lesser sacrifices, often not felt to be such by those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped by incompetence. It is better for the world if, instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the fallopian tubes."

It is highly evident that the church would like to arrogate all power to itself, but it is likewise evident that as enlightenment increases the church recedes, and even the power of the State must recognize that basic value is irretrievably vested in the individual.

In days gone by sovereigns ruled by "divine right." Now and in the future the right of the individual, divine or not, is becoming and must continue to become more firmly established. And this, it is needless to say, should apply to the right of a child—any child—to be well born, and under proper conditions.

## VIII. THE STATUS OF STERILIZATION LEGISLATION

According to a compilation made by Birthright, Inc., and shown in detail in its publication No. 5, 30 States have or have had compulsory sterilization laws. The publication gives a tabulation of sterilizations performed for various reasons in various States over a period of time. Cases in which sterilization was performed are listed as: the insane, the feeble-minded, and others.

States listed are: Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

In 1934 Alabama's law was found to be unconstitutional. In 1918, New York's law was declared to be unconstitutional. The ground of decision was that it denied equal protection of the law, because it did not include those at large as well as those in institutions.

In 1942, the Supreme Court of Washington declared the law unconstitutional because of technical deficiencies in the act. Nevada and New Jersey passed sterilization laws that were declared unconstitutional before they were applied.

Assemblyman Fred Sheppard, who introduced the model sterilization bill in the New Jersey Assembly, March 9, 1942, made the following statement:

"The law of nature says that only the fit shall survive. When a nation disregards this law by protecting the unfit, and encouraging their multiplication, that nation invites inevitable destruction. This world will always contain nations who live by the



sword and who believe that might makes right. The United States must meet this fact with might guided by right if we are to survive.

"How can a nation be strong if it is saturated with weaklings who are a burden to the strong? It is a matter of common knowledge that intelligent, educated people of the United States practice birth control. In cold logic, why should we not enforce upon our unfit a reasonable form of birth control and compel our irresponsible persons to do what our responsible persons do voluntarily?"

"As far as New Jersey is concerned, sterilization is an economic necessity, and as far as the United States is concerned, sterilization is a matter of national preservation."

Interestingly, Birthright would like increased action and has made the following statement:

"In South Dakota, where a census of the feeble-minded has been kept, the annual number born between January 1, 1910, and 1931 varied from 30 to 63 per 100,000, while in the States making some use of their sterilization law, the average number of operations done annually under the law has been only 2 per 100,000.

"Within the past 10 years the nearest approach to protecting maturing groups of feeble-minded was in Utah, which in 1943 sterilized 12 per 100,000.

"One could not expect important results from such a meager application of preventive treatment, yet in California's Sonoma State Pool alone sterilization has effected an annual saving of \$600,000."

In a Haldeman-Julius book entitled "Effects of Castration on Men and Women," I explained how castration of so-called sex criminals is done through a legal loophole in California. Briefly, a person convicted of a sex-crime may be given probation by the court of jurisdiction, or sentenced for life to a state institution—a penitentiary. The loophole through which castration may be "legally done" is that a court is empowered (in certain instances, at least) to specify under what conditions probation may be granted. One court, that of Judge Frank P. Collier, named as a condition requisite to probation that sex criminals of both sexes submit to castration.

I stated in the book referred to that legality through such a loophole is drastic and unreasonable. I repeat it. A person convicted of a crime and imprisoned can be released if evidence of false conviction arises. A person convicted and castrated remains castrated regardless of all evidence which may later turn up.

In this book I make no plea for compulsory sexual sterilization. This does not mean that I believe compulsory sexual sterilization to be against the rights of individuals nor that I believe otherwise than that selective sterilization can vastly improve the quality of the human family. All data presented indicate that I do believe that through the dissemination of knowledge, voluntary action may often be secured—and this may work greatly to the advantage of humanity.

The sterilization operation prevents parenthood—no more nor less.

It was stated in the first chapter that psychic reactions to sterilization may occur in rare instances, but that in these instances it has been found that a previous psychic disorder, or a trend toward such, existed. It is well here to point out that Major Frederick Hansen, a psychiatrist who is credited with having brought about highly successful treatment of war neuroses arising from World War II, stated: "There have been no real psychoses (insanity) brought on by war. Men are not driven crazy by war. The only insane soldiers are ones with a history of insanity." (See *Reader's Digest*, October, 1943, "There Is No Such Thing as Shell Shock," p. 63.)



The same logic used by Major Hansen applies to persons who show psychic reactions to sexual sterilization.

As opposed to castration, sexual sterilization has, under favorable circumstances, been reversed and fertility restored. This is easier in man than in woman. In man, the cut and closed ends of the spermatic cord may be cut so as to open these severed ends. With the lumen (canal) opened, a tube is inserted and the ends of the cord brought together and sutured over the tube.

In a woman the ovaries have been brought downward and implanted at the juncture of the fallopian tube and the uterine wall. Even when this operation is possible fertility is not always restored.

In electro-surgical sexual sterilization an instrument is passed through the vagina and into the uterus. When the tip of the instrument reaches the juncture of the womb and the fallopian tube a cauterizing current is turned on and as a rule the resulting scar tissue closes the tube. This method is not dependable. Closure does not always occur. A highly skilled (or otherwise lucky—if there is such a thing as luck) surgeon may be able, by passing a blunt and properly shaped instrument up into the uterine cavity, to open a closed tube and restore fertility.

The foregoing data belonged more properly in Chapter III, "The Sterilization Operation," but were held for the present chapter in order that a more thorough contrast of reversal prospects and the law might be made.

## IX. CRIME AND SEXUAL STERILIZATION

Not every person convicted of a crime is a criminal. Men and women have been convicted of murder and have spent years in prison to be later freed because "Justice" had erred and evidence had come to light proving the convicted persons innocent.

Under no circumstances should the mere fact of conviction of a crime be regarded as reason for legal sexual sterilization of any person.

Numerous unbiased observers are of the opinion that few persons become criminals solely as a result of environment. Persons with defective traits such as those described in Chapter V, or with similar traits, find it difficult to avoid response to the suggestions of a poor environment. It is because of this that many persons having traits such as those discussed, often become involved in crimes. Criminal behavior has been found to run through several generations of a family by reason of the fact that temperamental characteristics are inherited. It has been found that those with criminal tendencies respond to adverse environmental conditions and that when they become parents they are unable (and undesirous) to create a better environment for their children.

The relation of a sterilization program to the prison population is indicated by the data which follow.

Marion S. Norton's "Crime in Its Biological Aspects," explains:

"The classification of the inmates of New York State's nine prisons in 1930 showed 53.5 percent to be subnormal in intelligence, and another 27.3 percent to be feeble-minded, leaving but 19.2 percent of normal intelligence."

An intensive study, Sheldon and Glueck's "Five Hundred Delinquent Women," made under the auspices of the Institute of Criminal Law of the Harvard Law School, led its authors to make this comment:

"The women are on the whole a sorry lot. Burdened with feeble-mindedness, psychopathic personality and marked emo-



tional instability . . . the evidence is overwhelming that persons of the kind largely represented in our group are unfit to care for children. Yet a large proportion of them are irresponsible and prolific breeders."

According to figures compiled by the Human Betterment Foundation, there had been, up to January 1, 1942, 680 sterilizations performed on men in San Quentin Prison, California, the 680 men having petitioned for the sterilization operation.

In her work and sociological connections, Mrs. Marian S. Olden (executive secretary of Birthright, Inc.) is close to the heart of matters pertaining to racial improvement and other important considerations of the human family. In the following enlightening statement she refers to combatting crime:

"Our institutions are overcrowded and have long waiting lists. This forces premature parole in order to make room for urgent new cases. This congested condition is never long relieved by new buildings for no building program has kept pace with the increase caused by unrestricted breeding. Sterilization should be applied extensively enough to make it possible to institutionalize all defectives who need care, without overcrowding and without enlarging present facilities. But we must not expect to reduce present facilities if we are to effect a 100 percent coverage of these defectives in the population instead of the small percentage now segregated, which is not more than 10 percent in the best-equipped States.

"Billions of dollars now spent in trying to educate the uneducatable in the public schools, in combatting crime, in supporting chronic dependency would then be available for constructive purposes. Every normal child, no matter what his environment, might then be assured of opportunity to develop his abilities."

## X. THE QUESTION OF CLASS LEGISLATION

Whenever legislation of such a brand as to carry the faintest resemblance to *class* is proposed someone is always ready to start the chorus of howlers, by shouting "class legislation." The hue and cry is taken up and intoned and extolled far and near.

The adherents of papacy have high-pitched voices when it appears that something contrary to an Encyclical is proposed as legislation. I always envy the neurotic who vomits easily when I hear these shouts instead of a protest against too much legislation. It is because I feel this way that instead of attempting to discuss class legislation with relation to sexual sterilization, I am quoting from the pen of Mrs. Olden, because she has so well expressed the plain unvarnished and thoroughly untarnished facts:

"It is important to keep clearly in mind that a sound sterilization program makes no social distinctions. It is designed to check the reproduction of defectives wherever they may be found, in institutions or at large, in the richest family or in the poorest family, without regard to color, race or religion. Defectives tend to drift down in the social scale and their unrestricted breeding soon increases their numbers in the lower levels, hence it is inevitable that the majority of subjects for sterilization will be found in the slums, both rural and urban. But this fact reflects no selection other than that of guarding the human race from biological degeneration.

"The laboring classes, who regard this subject with suspicion,



should realize that its advocates are voluntarily subjecting themselves to the same discipline that would be used to regulate the fertility of others. The unfit are found among all types but among the informed and economically independent, defective offspring are sterilized or kept closely guarded from the possibility of parenthood. The only reason for legalizing the operation is to make it available for all, whereas now in States that have no sterilization law it is only possible for those who can afford to pay the medical costs.

"In 1913 the New Jersey law was declared unconstitutional on the ground of class discrimination because it applied to epileptics in institutions but failed to apply to epileptics at large. Modern sterilization makes no such divisions, the best example being the bills Numbers (170 and 171) introduced in the New Jersey Assembly in 1942."

## XI. STERILIZATION AND BIRTH CONTROL

Many readers may wonder why birth control is not resorted to instead of the advocacy of sexual sterilization. It should be clear that the average person who should not procreate is the very person who will determinedly neglect to consistently apply any given method of birth control. Next, it is well to point out that there is no effective means of birth control. The sexual sterilization operation is by no means birth control. It is, instead, parenthood prevention. So, of course, naturally, is castration. There is nothing drastic about sexual sterilization, while castration is, per se, drastic. It robs the body of glands that are valuable in the general economy—glands whose secretions contribute to the general health and well-being of the individual.

The claim has been made that vasectomy (tying the spermatic cords of the male—and severing these) is beneficial to the health and that potency and strength are improved, potency being prolonged. The subject is so controversial that to deal with it in the light of present knowledge is like playing with fire. One well known (internationally famous) surgeon was criticized by another equally well known physician who wrote an obituary on the death of the other, in the obituary, because of the dead man's claims during life in favor of the benefits of vasectomy.

As to birth control there is not, as yet, any perfectly effective method known. Physicians in all States except Connecticut (according to the latest available data) may legally give birth control information and supply or prescribe contraceptive modalities. The cost is not, or should not be, excessive. Regardless of this, the class of people who most urgently need to limit or control parenthood, are the very ones who rarely call upon a physician for aid in the matter of parenthood control.

In an effort to reach people needing to apply effective means—or means as effective as are known—the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, 501 Madison Avenue, New York (formerly the Birth Control Association), has established in practically every section of the United States clinics for the assistance of persons who do not or will not apply to their personal physicians for help.

It is contrary to federal law to send birth control information through the mails. This is because of a law advocated and secured by a sanctimonious pervert of a dead age.

In *Fillers*, January, 1947, issue, while enjoying the debunking and cocky quips of this saucy and humorous new magazine, I came on Editor Haldeman-Julius' line attributed to Groucho Marx: "What this country needs is a good five-cent psychiatrist." He could have said also that what this country needs is a good nickel congress. A law such as the



Comstock law against the dissemination of birth control data through the mails, etc., smacks of the papal Encyclical which has man begotten for heaven and eternity—and not for this earth. One wonders what the hell the Pope thinks a man creeps around here on earth for anyway.

The Pope sets heaven and the church up as being over the State, the family and the individual. Civil law has no right to arrogate this or that to its jurisdiction, says the Pope. The Comstock law would prevent humans from having knowledge to which they are entitled without restraint or restriction. Fortunately a lot of good Catholic people favor civil rather than papal law in their most realistic affairs of life.

Early in this book I mentioned that I would give information to those desiring sexual sterilization but encountering difficulty in finding a physician willing to perform the operation for them. I have so repeatedly referred to good material made available by one organization that it should hardly be necessary to explain that those desiring help will meet with courteous assistance if they will but contact Birthright, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey.

## XII. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Birth and heredity have been likened by writers and others to a strange lottery. I have read one statement to the effect that I am myself and you are you as a matter of one chance in millions—or billions. Those who write thus speak of this "lottery" to call attention to the fact that out of a huge number of spermatozoa—millions upon millions of them and billions of chromosomes—one particular sperm happened to be the one to cause fertilization of the ovum—the union of the two being the cellular element from which we developed.

Information on an important factor of fertility is in order.

An examination of the semen to determine whether one is fertile is not always conclusive. When semen is prepared for microscopic examination, and is examined, many doctors and technicians stop at determining that spermatozoa are present and that these have life. Indeed, spermatozoa may have, to the casual eye, an unusual amount of life—and yet be incapable of fertilizing an ovum. In a single discharge of semen there may be a mere handful of spermatozoa capable of fertilizing an ovum in the event it has a chance to contact an ovum in its proper location in the female genital tract. The spermatozoon (singular for spermatozoa) winning the race and traveling to the right place to contact an ovum, is the sperm with the greatest motility—the most life—the greatest power. Thus, a semen examination which fails to determine the rate of speed of the spermatozoa, cannot render a positive and conclusive report on fertility or sterility.

As for the millions of spermatozoa losing the race—they might just as well have been non-existent. Birth, therefore, is not such a lottery after all. The fact is comparable to the fact in physics that if a tree falls in the forest and the vibrations created by the fall fail to reach ears which interpret these vibrations as sound—there is no sound.

It appears to be not birth, but environment, which may be considered as a matter of chance—a strange lottery. Of course, no person can determine from the union of which sperm and which egg he will spring. And once this union has taken place there is no natural turning aside. But one may be born into an untold number of environmental circumstances. After birth the environment may change time and time again. Unfavorable hereditary antecedents may fail to manifest if a child is reared under good environmental conditions. On the other hand, there are persons who appear to be little influenced either by heredity or early environment. Intensive study of such individuals would reveal the in-



fluence of hereditary factors although neither parent might have any direct influence on the child's heredity.

One case with which I am thoroughly familiar concerns four children left semi-orphans in early childhood. The first child was a girl. She was 6 years old when her mother died and the father of all four children practically abandoned them. We will call this oldest child A. The next child, also a girl, was 4 when the mother died. We will call her B. C was a 2-year-old boy, and D was an infant.

A went to live with her maternal grandparents—steady and industrious German-American immigrants. C was adopted by a family of means. B and D fell to an aunt—their father's sister.

A lived in a good home where plenty abounded, but never extravagance. She was kept under strict rule and passing into adolescence became what is known as sexually wild. This lasted for a few months and she married and settled down. For an undetermined reason both A and her husband were apparently sterile. At this time they have been married several years—both are still young—but they have no children. They have not practiced any method of birth control. A and her husband are thrifty and industrious. They have a modern home and are steadily increasing their fortune. To all appearances they enjoy life and living. There was nothing spectacularly abnormal (not to a scientific sexologist at least) in A's little adolescent fling.

C, being adopted by parents above the average in intelligence, learned rapidly and well in school. The adopted parents did not have children and C grew up somewhat spoiled—much as any only child of moderately wealthy parents might have done. Even a close observer, not knowing, would not have suspected that C was not the flesh and blood of his adopted parents. He was at the right age to be drafted soon after World War II involved the United States. He was rejected for a disability—too great for armed forces acceptance, and yet hardly noticeable in ordinary life. He is now advancing in college work and promises to become just such a citizen as he might have been expected to become had he been the natural son of his foster-parents.

With B and D matters were quite different. They were reared in a home which seemed to know nothing but confusion and alternate periods of semi-prosperity and near dire poverty. They were forced to attend church and Sunday school before they even knew what the pictures they were given represented. And to religious functions they were compelled to go whether their clothing more than covered that which was required for what is regarded as common decency. *That*, of course, was mandatory with the aunt who raised them. They were raised with cousins, all of whom were older. And in a family of in-law-relations both of their aunt and of her husband.

The aunt, a woman who professed great religious scruples, also professed great love for these children of her brother. They were devoted to her—in an abstract way. Their environment was one of constant confusion. Among the in-law conglomeration they had several "bosses." They were required to "mind" all of the older people who were around them. When both were nearing adolescence they went for a summer visit with their maternal grandparents. They never returned to their former environment.

As both advanced in school, World War II brought the United States into the entanglement. B went to work in war industry and D went to serve in the military forces. Both acquitted themselves well. D won many honors and citations. B later returned to school. She is now on her own and giving an excellent account of herself. D is employed in a highly lucrative position.

A and C responded rather normally to their environments. Perhaps B and D were influenced to a favorable extent by environmental influences other than those of the home in which they lived. They have



now been away from that early environment for a number of years. They have at least responded normally to their changed environments. They hate even the memory of their early childhood environment and this may be regarded as a healthy sign—a completely normal reaction.

The finest plant will not respond favorably to an undesirable environment. Neither of the four children I have just discussed showed noticeable inherent traits of their parents or other immediate relatives. We can hardly believe plants to have intelligence. Human beings are creatures of intelligence and these four children gave no evidence of being influenced by immediate hereditary factors. They did not respond to early environment—considering early environment first as the parental roof. A and C responded to their adopted environment. B and D did not respond.

The conclusion here is (1) that these children did respond to environment when environment became favorable and (2) that each of them must have had hereditary factors from a number of generations back along their line of descent.

### XIII. CONCLUSION

Sexual sterilization is a procedure which lends itself to easy accomplishment by any competent surgeon. There are some 25 States having so-called compulsory sterilization laws—i.e., certain persons may be compelled to submit to sexual sterilization under certain circumstances. Various civic organizations, schools, laboratories, teachers, educators, writers and publishers are constantly engaged in an effort to enlighten the public to the extent that a greater number of persons of poor heredity will seek, voluntarily, to have themselves sexually sterilized.

Those who advocate sexual sterilization in selected cases seek to improve the qualities of the human family and to transmit this improvement to posterity. The chief opposition comes from the church. Politicians are not averse to the fact that votes from deficient citizens are as helpful in the matter of being elected to office as are votes from the elite.

To judge by the nature of the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, quoted herein, the Catholic church desires that the greatest mass of humanity adhering to Roman Catholic principles of faith, remain in the dark ages—darkness practically as great as that which existed in the day of the Inquisition. Fortunately for humanity no great number of Catholics conform to the papal encyclicals.

Many doctors are uninterested in performing sexual sterilization operations. Numerous doctors are opposed to sexual sterilization because of biases. Few doctors of the Catholic faith will perform the sexual sterilization operation.

Under ordinary circumstances it is not easy to find doctors who are willing to do sexual sterilization operations. Many doctors fear the possibility of malpractice suits. It would seem that persons who seek sexual sterilization and later sue the doctors who performed such operations are of a certainty persons who should be sexually sterilized. They are unstable. Rarely has a doctor lost a malpractice suit for having performed a sexual sterilization operation. Few attorneys, even of the shyster class, will file such suits. Law and precedent favor the doctor in practically every case.

In one suit which reached the Supreme Court of the United States the ruling was that there had been excellent reasons for severing a woman's fallopian tubes.

In presenting the information embodied in this book I have sought



to bring information to the uninformed and I am aware that but few people have any extensive acquaintance with the subject of sexual sterilization. Persons who may meet with personal indications for ethical sterilization at any time often wish that they had previously found such information as this book contains.

It was explained in the introductory chapter that I have had urgent requests for help in locating physicians willing to do sexual sterilization operations. Two instances were cited. My files are heavy with letters concerning sexual sterilization. Many of the letters are frantic pleas for assistance. They reach me because of certain educational work in which I am engaged. Through county medical societies, through various institutions, and through certain favorable organizations of a civic nature, I often find help for these individuals.

Humor sometimes creeps into the correspondence. Not long ago a woman wrote me that her husband had been in jail for minor offenses a number of times within the last 12 months. She wanted to know if I could advise her as to the name of a doctor in her locality who was capable of castrating her husband and who would be willing to do the operation, and she wanted to know if it would hurt her husband much. Replying, I advised that castration was a rather radical operation and explained that I would, however, see what I could learn as to a doctor who might be willing to help her. While I sparred for time I contacted a welfare organization in the correspondent's home town. What I learned was revealing. The woman's husband was a good provider. Like many men, he enjoyed a bottle of beer. He had never been known to be drunk or disorderly, but he had opposed the "ins" of a political clique in his city with all his might. He was the father of four healthy children and his wife was a clean, neat, and industrious woman—incidentally much in love with her husband. She, of course, wanted her husband sterilized.

In reply to my letter explaining that castration was a rather radical operation, the lady wrote: "Look, doc, I got four healthy children. I don't want my husband hurt. I love him. The last baby nearly killed me getting here. Maybe my three boys will be like their pop and drink beer and get put in jail and that makes me ashamed every time it happen. I am Spanish-American woman and my mama have 16 children. That be to many for me. Please. I want my husband fix so he can't get no more children and if that ain't castration I don't know what you call it."

A birth control clinic sponsored by the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., was asked to contact my correspondent. The case worker was welcomed with open arms. A few days later, however, my correspondent developed appendicitis. Being advised of the facts, a conscientious doctor did a mid-line incision and tied the fallopian tubes. The patient was advised of this. She felt that somehow I was responsible for everything, and when permitted to sit up and write she thanked me but scolded me for not telling her what castration actually meant.

In this particular instance neither husband nor wife was actually defective. They were able to properly provide for and educate four children. The woman was developing a neurosis and might later have suffered seriously. This in turn could have affected any other children born to her. No one suffered through her sterilization and the healthy children of the family gained infinitely. This was doubtless a gain for the community as well.

In a few instances I have failed to be of help to correspondents—especially in the matter of sterilization. These failures proved to me that it is more difficult than one would ordinarily imagine, for a person desiring voluntary sterilization to find suitable surgical services.

One man, 75, wrote me that he had a prolific young wife. He did not want any more children. He loved those he had, but at his age small children and their noises were driving him to distraction. His personal physician had laughed at him when he asked to be sterilized. He wanted



to know if I could advise him of a physician within a reasonable distance who would be willing to perform the operation for him.

Quite a few men have retained fertility and potency beyond the age of 75, and I at once initiated correspondence in favor of the young man of 75. Just as a doctor was located I received a letter from the correspondent explaining that in early life he lived on an isolated ranch. Needing circumcision he had consulted a doctor in the nearest town. The doctor had wanted \$25 for the circumcision operation and the patient had returned home and, using his razor, had circumcised himself. Recalling this experience, and having some knowledge of his sexual anatomy from domestic veterinary practice, he attempted to do a sexual sterilization operation on himself. He was not so fortunate in this. After making a generous slit in one side of the scrotum he fainted. His personal physician was called and completed the operation. His attempt was dangerous. His early self-circumcision was likewise dangerous although primitive people of today with no knowledge of modern surgery and using stones for knives perform circumcision ritually as an initiation of the youth into manhood.

The practice of infibulation of native African girls is doubtless meant to serve as a method of temporary sexual sterilization. In infibulation the vaginal orifice is closed by a surgical procedure practiced by native women. Modern physicians who have been permitted to examine a few of these patients have pronounced the operation as usually being skillfully done. The temporary sterilization in these instances is easily reversed. Either the woman or the husband (when the girl marries), using what to us would seem a rather crude instrument, carefully reopens the vaginal orifice.

Among the lower animals and even among insects parenthood control is practiced after a fashion. When the queen bee takes her flight for fertilization it is the male who flies the fastest who mates with the queen. This would certainly seem to be parenthood control and survival of the fittest.

The female animal in heat does not appear to be choosy. Yet, a rule of parenthood control seems to prevail when a number of eligible male animals have access to the female. In these cases the survival of the fittest seems to be the rule insofar as the male is concerned. The winning candidate for fatherhood may be compared with a saying attributed to a confederate general who said that the winner of a battle was the one "who got there the fustest with the mostest."

Breeders of fine animals exercise the most careful selection of parents. The human animal is plagued by morals, ethics, religion and taboos. He is unlike the dog spoken of in the following words by Dr. Edward C. Mason in his book, "Why We Do It." Dr. Mason said:

"Fortunately for the dog he is not plagued by morals, ethics, religion and various taboos, as the interplay of these, thwarting his ego desires and sex urge, would doubtless produce many neurotic dogs."

In Doctor Mason's words there may be more than a faint glimmer of a key to the reason for so many neurotic human beings.

Man is certainly plagued by morals, ethics, religion and taboos. Even when the conscientious individual realizes that he is neurotic, probably psychotic, and feels that he should not reproduce his kind, he must be plagued by the ethics, religion and taboos of others through whom he seeks help in accomplishing that which he believes to promise personal benefit and benefit to humanity.

Sexual sterilization is simple, safe, and, for parenthood control, effective. But set out tomorrow, especially with modest funds in your pocket, and try to get sexually sterilized. You may readily succeed. The chances are you won't. If you are inclined toward "imbibing" you'll probably end up by using alcohol not to disinfect or antisepticize, but to sterilize your conscience for having credited your fellow humans with greater understanding than you found them to possess.



# NOTES AND COMMENTS

By E. Haldeman-Julius

*Reprinted from The American Freeman, Published at Girard, Kansas.*

## DON'T BE A DON'T KNOW

Some future historian may be tempted to call this fifth decade of the 20th Century the Age of Quiz or the Probe. From our Information Please to England's Brains Trusts, in which a group of reputedly learned men exhibit their skill in concealing their ignorance of the answers to questions, this form of entertainment has spread over many lands. As an entertainment it is certainly superior to gawking at a Marathon Dance, a man living like an ape on the top of a flagpole or risking suicide in a block of ice, or a hundred other dissipations in which the men and women of our age seek relief from the many formidable problems which are supposed to oppress them. An unfortunate result of it, however, is that just in regard to those problems it reveals an amazing ignorance or inaccuracy. We find prodigies of learning amongst our young folk, to whom we are passing on the control of a puzzling world, when it is a question of films, titles of insipid modern songs, names of bible-stimulating crooners, or the prowess of ball-teams. But when it comes to questions about the problems of the world they are going to control one fourth of them don't know, and on analysis, most of the others (old and young, male, female and neuter) just repeat what the rich owner of their particular newspaper wants them to think.

The most famous orator of ancient times, Demosthenes, tells us in one of his speeches that the Athenians of his time were one great note of interrogation, What's the news? or What do you know? He blisters them with invective because they ask the wrong questions. At least they wanted to know, but in our time "Don't Know" is considered a mark of intellectual strength. In 1869 an odd sort of forum was opened in London. Charles Darwin had set the thinking world aflame, and someone proposed that distinguished representatives of every shade of opinion from Roman Catholicism to Atheism should meet to debate. Professor Thomas H. Huxley was, of course, a leading member of this Metaphysical Club, as it called itself—setting up a barbed wire fence, so to say, to keep out politicians, workingmen, and ladies—and he had to choose what school he would represent, particularly in regard to religion. The correct label would be Atheist, but that would put him in the disreputable society of wicked Charles Bradlaugh. So he proved by philosophic reasoning, by means of which Aristotle had proved that the earth is flat and the frog has a soul, that man cannot possibly know whether there is a God or not, so, of course, he was a Don't Know (Agnostic). It was only in the genial atmosphere of his home, with kindred spirits like Tyndall and Clifford about him, that he found he had a decided opinion about the value of proofs of the existence of God.

Since those days Don't Knowism has been a perfectly respectable attitude. With its application to religion we are not here concerned, but it is one of the most foolish things to say about oneself in regard to fundamental religious beliefs. The man who scratches his head and says "I don't know," as millions now do, when you ask him if he believes in God obviously has no belief in God and is, on the authority of the



leading dictionaries, an Atheist. But we deal with that elsewhere. On the other hand it may be creditable to him if he cannot say offhand who won the battle of Cannae, what a whozis is, or which were Greta Garbo's best pictures. The man whose head is full of such details is apt to know too little about bigger matters. What is deplorable is that such vast numbers of folk have to say Don't Know when you ask them, for instance, what we mean by the balance of trade, what the difference is between Personal Enterprise and Private Enterprise, whether Portugal and Brazil are Fascist states, how Chiang Kai-shek got the position he holds, whether Russia is recovering as fast as France, why American troops remain in Italy, whether the provinces which Russia has taken from Poland are Russian or Polish, whether the more religious countries are less criminal than the less religious, and a thousand other facts that are basic to modern controversies, but most of the papers prefer people to be ignorant of the answers.

An eccentric writer, one of those materialistic guys whose ideas are so properly ignored in periodical literature, has said that the time has come in the development of democracy when the people must have representatives in a non-political Congress which shall every week issue a paper giving the full facts of science, history, or contemporary events that should form the basis of judgment on current topics and then pass on the people's verdict to the political representatives. These unpractical idealists, you exclaim! They might as well ask Hearst to send completely impartial correspondents to Moscow and report its progress or the reverse accurately and fully every week or so. Don't forget that it was these unpractical idealists who fought a defeated Feudalism and superstition in the last century and opened to us the avenue of progress with its two chief obstacles removed; though we have allowed the reactionaries in large part to replace them.

But we will admit that the idea of having representatives to watch political representatives and foreign correspondents to correct other correspondents is—well, just an idea. The first thing the reactionaries would do would be to attempt to suppress it as an outrage on the honor of Congress: the second thing would be to remove heaven, earth, hell, and the gold deposit to buy it out. The most practical hope at the moment is in small weeklies or monthlies that give you all relevant news on facts and fearlessly criticize all false statements of them. None of this "Oh woodman spare that tree" business. Keep back or embroider a single fact that tells against religion, conventional morals, or the political or economic life and the thin end of the wedge is in. The conomic radical who can't read a criticism of his religious beliefs is a Don't Know. So is the Atheist who won't read a criticism of his political or economic beliefs. And don't imagine that to be a Knower instead of a Don't Knower in regard to things that matter—and that means things that matter to your life and welfare and pleasures—means cutting out the club, the dance, the game of poker, or the movies. You don't need to know what Cephalopods or Bryophyta are, or how Colonial Architecture differs from Gothic, to get a sound judgment on the problems of the hour. The world's confusion is maintained, even deepened, because a limited number of facts on a limited number of subjects are suppressed or falsified. See that you get them, and get them straight.

\* \* \*

## GOD AND THE MATHEMATICIANS

The *Reader's Digest* (December, 1946), which is supposed to reach more than 10,000,000 people, has a "digest" of A. Cressy Morrison's book "Man Does Not Stand Alone." Looking over our melancholy world just now we'd say that man might make a better job of it if he realized that he does stand alone and had better pull himself together. Does the author suggest that the deliberations at UN have got on so brilliantly that there must be a divine oracle behind the screen? Apparently he,



like most mathematicians, can think anything. He opens with the statement that in the modern progress of science "every increase of light reveals more brightly the handiwork of an intelligent Creator"—note that he'll have nothing to do with unintelligent Creators—and that in a "spirit of scientific humility" we are "approaching even nearer to an awareness of God." That explains, of course, why the percentage of scientific men in America who believe in God fell from 42 in 1914 to 30 in 1933, as stated by themselves; and as those who declined to answer may certainly be presumed to be Skeptics and many of the believers were in sectarian institutions, the real situation can be guessed. All this is a trifle to the intrepid mathematician. He has formidable proofs of the existence of God. The first is one of those pieces of mathematical juggling like those by which you prove how many electrons there are in the super-universe or how many trillion times you must deal out a deck of cards to give each player a full suit of 13. The other six arguments are biological—and threadbare. Moral as usual. It takes an authority on "dead matter" to prove that there are immaterial existences. About 80 percent of the authorities on those fields of nature in which these immaterial beings were supposed to exist don't see it. The 10,000,000 Americans are assured once more that science has discovered God.



## IS LYING AN ART OR A SCIENCE?

Some time in the last century a distinguished ecclesiastic and an agnostic scientist had a fine literary quarrel about the ethics of lying. It was in the period when educated clerics were realizing that their old arguments were out of date and they must pose as the only guardians of social and political justice. The prelate was stern and inflexible. He knew, of course, that religious writers were lying all round him but that was for the sake of a higher truth. Confronted with the classical dilemma, if you met a cut-throat with a razor chasing his wife and he asked you which way she had gone you would, he said, have to tell the truth. A lie shakes the foundations of the universe. The world went on lying—at the rate of a billion a minute, it is calculated, for the whole race—but the sort of lying in, for instance, a Methodist Women's Club, when the ladies tell each other how much the husband earns, what they pay the help, or what they gave for the new hat, is neither a science nor an art but an innocent pastime. At the worst it's a plain nuisance. Truthfulness is a virtue in the sense that life would be a lot easier if it were generally cultivated. In our time mendacity has reached the heroic scale. You can't even believe a politician or a bishop. You might say that lying has become a fine art, but on the whole it ought perhaps to be classed as an industry like making poison gas. Our Knights of Columbus ought to do something about it.



## OUR RICH WORLD

The other day somebody unearthed a tailor's bill for making a suit of clothes a century ago. The charge was \$4.20. Presumably the customer supplied the cloth, as was then common, but on the other hand there were no tailoring machines in those days, and we have to imagine the tailor working 12 or 14 hours a day for the best part of a week in some unwholesome den and largely by candlelight. The same suit, machine-made, cost \$15 by the end of the century, and today about \$35 to \$50. As this applies to a great deal of consumers' goods as well as rents and other important items, it raises some curious questions. We say that we today produce with the same volume of manual labor, 10 times the wealth that men did 100 years ago, or that our collective wealth is enormously greater. To what extent is this due to the fact that com-



modities have trebled in money value but are worth just the same in terms of human service? We say that the average wage of the weekly wage earner is three or four times what it was a century ago. To what extent does the increase merely meet the increased cost of things? And what's the real value of all these machines which do work that it took 5, 10 or 20 men to do a century ago? This doesn't mean that the real standard of life hasn't vastly improved. It has. But it shows how desirable it is to see that everybody has some knowledge of economic realities. The mechanism of exchange which underlies the greater part of our life, since it is this that enables us to receive the reward of labor in goods and services, is really understood by few people. Men read every day of a house that was built for \$3,000 being priced at \$6,000, a picture that was painted for a good dinner or two selling for \$10,000 or more, a piece of jewelry fetching \$50,000, and so on. Even high school children could be taught what this means. We read that good meat costs 4c a pound in Argentina. What does it cost where you live and why?

\* \* \*

## THE TRAGEDY OF SPAIN

Almost the only European country to retain, after the fall of Napoleon, the liberties which the French Revolution has inspired was Spain. It lost them by the revolting treachery and brutality of one of the most contemptible monarchs in Europe and, when the Spaniards disarmed the beast, French armies, then under a Catholic king, marched into Spain and put the slug back on his throne. Twice again the people flung out a worthless monarch and recovered power. There was no more courageous and self-sacrificing nation in Europe: at least none braver than the democrats and liberals of Spain. After four years of agony in our own time under the dictator General de Rivera they still had strength to win back freedom and democracy, and when a body of rebel generals brought in the butchers of Germany and Italy and strangled the people once more, America and Britain cried Hands Off to those who would help the Spanish people. We have continued to look on without a shudder or a protest while the Spaniards suffered agony for the fourth or fifth time, and for a longer period than ever: agonies which they might never have had to suffer had not Britain and France set up a profoundly hypocritical Non-Intervention Committee in London and Roosevelt blasted all promises of American aid. Is the recall of our ambassadors all that we can do to redeem the wrong we did the Spanish people? A stern economic boycott, a contemptuous ostracism of Franco's representatives, and an exposure of the lies in certain sections of our rotten press would afford evidence that our isolationism has really ended in a concern about tyranny and corrupt and cruel oligarchy in other lands.

\* \* \*

## DID JEFFERSON LEARN FROM THE JESUITS?

A reader raises again a question that's been discussed in my publications. Is it true that Thomas Jefferson and other Fathers of the Revolution got the idea of democracy from Jesuit theologians of the 16th and 17 centuries? That remarkable Jesuit discovery of the last decade or two is, it appears, being trumpeted in Catholic circles all over our country. If Catholic apologists in this country would condescend, as they rarely do, to give exact quotations and references to support such statements it might amuse a few leisured people to look up the works of Father Suarez or Cardinal Bellarmine — just to see if the propagandists are practicing their customary arts. There are, perhaps, six cities in this



country where you might be able to see these old and profoundly tedious works, and even in those cities there's probably not one man in 100,000, Catholic or non-Catholic, who'll take the trouble. It's the same with Jefferson's works and letters, which run to many volumes. So it's fairly safe to make such statements. But even if we were given proof that Jefferson ever read these books of ancient wisdom, which must have been as rare as saints in the America of that time and found praise of the Republican form of government in them, we should smile at the idea that that was the inspiration of his political zeal. Americans faced and suffered under the crass tyranny of King George, and that seems to be enough as an inspiration. My reader, however, would like to know probably how it's possible to pretend to find such modern political sentiments in these intensely reactionary theologians. Just look at their date—after the Reformation. All theologians at that time taught the divine right of kings (except against the Pope). But after 1550 half the kings of Europe became Protestant, and it was the work of theologians now to prove that it was a virtue, not a sacrilege, to dethrone them and for the people to choose another (if a Catholic). Some Jesuits went so far as to justify murdering them. In Catholic countries this Jesuit wisdom was forgotten again until democracy triumphed over royal feudalism in the 19th century.

\* \* \*

## THE GOAT SHOWS THE WAY

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast" a poet said: and it might well be applied to the aspirations which were born in the man-woman struggle of 1880 to 1920. Unfortunately there are aspects of human nature, to put it delicately, which impose a burden on women which even the most desperate of them could see no chance of compelling the male to share. When Professor Haeckel, in his popular works on evolution, pointed out that all mammal males have shrivelled or stunted mammary glands and that in a large number of cases, which are duly noted in medical dictionaries, these are fully developed and the man can suckle the young, a ray of hope of sharing at least part of the burden with the husband penetrated the minds of a few radical women. Most women, of course, took the word of the parson that all this talk about male breasts (which they had seen daily in baby boys since they were four to five years old) was just a piece of Atheist-scientist lying. There may be a reanimation of the old hope. *Current Science* (October, 1946), the admirable organ of Hindu men of science, gives an authenticated report of a male goat that had been yielding milk for the last 12 months. Analysis confirmed that it was no base imitation but the genuine fluid. Considering the triumphs of science in the last 50 years, can we say that it's hopeless to think that it may do on a larger scale what nature still does occasionally?

\* \* \*

## THE WRECKERS

The southwest corner of England, which is still inhabited by descendants of the ancient Britons who were driven to it by the Anglo-Saxons, has a fearsome and jagged granite coast. These Cornishmen, even as late as 100 years ago, used to lure ships on to the rocks by lighting fires on the cliffs, and they largely lived on the loot that floated ashore from the wrecks. When light-houses were introduced they fiercely resisted building any on their coast. They were known as The Wreckers; just as some men in other parts of Britain—the Body Snatchers—lived by stealing corpses from graves and selling them to the surgeons, and in other places large bodies of the workers—the Luddites—



smashed up all the cotton-spinning machines that manufacturers set up. These were features of the Good Old Days when everybody went to church and honored the king. But the old arts survive in a new form. Reactionaries wreck new ideas, lie about them, libel their authors, injure the people who adopt them. Some good folk think that we ought to appease these wreckers and cooperate with them. "I saw the smiter in his wrath," sang an American poet, whose poem (to discredit the radical) has become a hymn of the appeasers. But perhaps the smiter was only smiting wreckers. Perhaps the "merely destructive" work on which these superior people frown is to destroy the forces that obstruct progress. Let's be Anti-Wreckers—and proud of it.



## THE AGONIES OF PEACE

It is taking people a long time to realize that the iron logic of facts has much disturbed the division of periods of national life into the horrid days of war and what used to be called "the piping days of peace." What would be the verdict if some team of social students could compile some sort of estimate of what America suffered, respectively, in the period 1929-1936 and the war-period 1942-5? Doubtless the very idea of making such a comparison would startle most people, but we wonder. During the war three to four million men in the armed forces, who saw action in the various fields of land, sea, and air, either lost their lives or suffered more or less severely. A few million at home mourned the dead or suffered the gravest anxiety. Most of the rest of the nation had more money, and consequently more pleasure, than ever. In the period from the fall of 1929 to the time when big orders for munitions began to arrive, there was an average of eight to 10 million jobless. In some years the authorities put the figure at 12 million. The men put it at 15 million. Count in their families, the traders who lost their custom, professional men, etc. We are necessarily vague, as no sociologist seems to think it worth while (or safe) to make a severe scientific inquiry, but we wonder. The curious thing is that so few people do wonder or want to know why. A recent Gallup Poll returns that only about 20 percent are confident that the great depression will not return in 1947; yet they all dance as merrily as ever. Hardly one in 100 can give the flimsiest explanation why. It will be a good thing for the country when the majority at least will be as keen on understanding the agonies of peace as on knowing the merit of the latest trashy picture from Hollywood.



## WHY CHINA LAGS

China is exceptional amongst the ancient civilizations in the fact that it did not reconcile reality and religion by saying that the gods had created the world all beautiful and bright and men had fouled it by robbing the divine orchard or something. Early Chinese annals make the race start with animal ancestors. On the other hand they surpass all others in their claim of antiquity for their civilization. If, as is usual, you date the beginning of civilization from the earliest traces of written language, it seems to have started in China about 1500 B.C. Even that, however, is more than 500 years before the Jews or any nations in Europe were civilized, and it puts the Chinese people in a different light from that in which most people see it. In the 7th century A.D., when Europe had fallen back into barbarism, China had a fine civilization. But it took an exceptionally strong and able man to overcome China's great disadvantage of isolation from all other civilizations, and no such rulers arose after Tai Tsung. When contact with the western civilizations was renewed they put in the foreground a religion which the



Chinese despised and the contact brought no stimulation. In the 19th century a full contact with secular elements of western civilizations was established, but these appeared to the Chinese mainly as greedy traders who wanted to exploit the people. At last Chinese like Sun Yat-sen learned the best ideas of the west and set out to use them to raise up their people. Why do they still lag? Because wealthy Chinese united with the Japs, the British, and the Americans to put the adventurer Chiang Kai-shek in power and give him a modern army. Some time within the next 50 years China will rise to its full height and perhaps cooperate with a fully developed India. That means nearly half the race or, by that time, a billion people with bitter memories. We had better get rid of atom bombs and war before that time comes.



## THE THINGS THAT MATTER

A reader, presumably Jewish, writes to pound us with heavy sarcasm. In our occasional references to Jewish matters we are, it seems, grossly ignorant, bigoted, unwilling to learn, offensive to Jews, etc. He consulted his rabbi about what we said, and this gentleman gave him a few more epithets to throw at us and told him that it was waste of time trying to teach Haldeman-Julius and The Freeman the honest truth about the Jews. By this time the reader's eye-brows will be up in his hair. What on earth, he will ask, is this monstrous injustice to the Jews that these microscopists have discovered in a paper that has flayed the anti-Semites over and over again? Well, this is what our severe critic and his rabbi say. Any man who talks about a "Jewish people" or a "Jewish race is either a crass ignoramus or one of those poisonous anti-Semites. There is a Jewish religion but the people and the race are Hebrew. We rubbed our eyes. We had a vague idea that if there was any real distinction it was the other way about: that Hebrew ("the folk from beyond the river") was properly an ancient and semi-religious name. However, we are always eager to learn. We looked up a batch of American papers of the Hebrew-Jewish people and found that half of them called themselves Hebrew and half Jewish, and it was on no religious ground. We opened the Jewish Encyclopedia, which really ought to know, and we found that on the very first page it spoke of the Jewish people, and the Jewish race, and in the articles on Hebrew and Jews it had never heard of our critic's distinction. . . . Seriously, can't we leave this sort of thing to the godly and concentrate on the things that matter?



## THE RELIGIOUS THUGS

The last few weeks have given us another painful illustration of how the press practices dishonesty without lying. If the late war had been upon Russia and it had behaved with the savagery of the Nazis what a song and dance about Atheism there would have been in the entire American press when the Russian people were crushed and their leaders hanged. But did you read one single line in one of the papers on the moral as regards religion of the Nuremberg executions? On the Sunday before the executions, we were told, Catholic and Protestant chaplains put up special prayers in the cells of 10 out of the 11 condemned thugs, and the correspondent added: "The one exception was Alfred Rosenberg, Atheist Nazi philosopher, who refused prayers." On the morning of the fated day: "All the 11 have been reading the Bible in their last hours, except Rosenberg, so-called philosopher of Nazism." After the execution the bodies were cremated "against the religious convictions of the families of the five who were Catholics." So of the most monstrous criminals of our time five were Catholics (though Catholics



are less than a fifth of the German population), five Protestants, and one Atheist. As Rosenberg had the case against him pressed because he was an Atheist, and it was the Catholic Franz von Papen, who boasts in a published lecture that he had the chief part in getting power for the Nazis, who ought to have been hanged instead of him, and as Rosenberg met his fate with more dignity than the others, the lesson as regards religion and character is complete. But the papers, which refuse to notice it, will continue to shriek about the dangers to our Christian civilization of godless Russia.

\* \* \*

## CLERICS TRY A BRAINS TRUST

In October, 1946, the authorities of the Church of England announced that a carefully selected Brains Trust would answer questions before a public audience in London. To a question about heaven ("Shall we be able to recognize our friends in heaven?") they replied by insisting on what we thought was the extinct belief in the resurrection of the body. "Artists' pictures of nightgowns as togas were all wrong," they said. We shall have our real bodies but "not subject to their present weaknesses" (such as clothes). How nice—and what a smack in the eye for psychology. As to hell ("Is the soul of an unrepentant sinner eternally lost?") they escaped by submitting that it was quite impossible to give a definite meaning to the word "unrepentant." It looks simple enough. Anyhow, no eternal torment, they agreed. "Exclusion from the life" is the real boiling oil. We get a vague picture of billions of transformed but still ugly mortals pressing for all eternity against the rails of the park in which the eternal garden party is held. The third chief question was "How can I reconcile my belief that God is love with the spirit of evil in creation?" and it seems, plain as it is, to have bowled over the selected doctors of divinity. The chief oracle said: "Frankly, I don't know," and the question master postponed the reply to the next merry meeting. The churches will probably decide that it is much better to continue to rely on dictators, electoral pressure on democratic governments, gold, and the bedside manner. "Women outnumbered men by three to one in the congregation," said the press.

## POPULARIZING SCIENCE

I listened last night to a broadcast talk on science by a master of his subject. It was learned and exact and from an educational point of view almost entirely futile. It was on penicillin and related to matters about which even many frivolous members of the public would like to have a few clear ideas. But just when you flattered yourself that you had got into stride with the distinguished professor he knocked you out with the scientific name of a bacillus or a mold—probably half his hearers did not know the difference between the two and did not care a damn about it—or some medical term of the jaw-breaking variety. We hear lots of these talks, and they are nearly all as bad. Few of the professors seem to have heard the elementary truth as it is known to experts in talking to the public, that the moment you use a big unfamiliar word you put a fog in the minds of your hearers and break their attention. The professor automatically uses words and phrases which are the best means of expressing his ideas in his own field, but are just Latin and Greek to the inexpert. "The best popularizer is the expert," said a scientific weekly, pompously. On the contrary, he is as a rule the worst. There never was an age in which it was more useful socially to explain science, from physics to economics, to the public, and certainly there was never before an age with such superb resources for doing it. But private enterprise in the work is, as usual, spoiled by commercial considerations. Even professors like dollars and spotlights.



